



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

C. W.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,808	10/31/2003	Anthonia M Adeokun	06275-264002 / AFG/100135	2444
26161	7590	05/23/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		SWITZER, JULIET CAROLINE		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1634		

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/698,808	ADEOKUN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 12-45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claim 31, drawn to methods to assess the pharmacogenetics of a drug, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - II. Claims 34-38, drawn to methods for treating patients, classified in class 435, subclass 6 and class 424, for example.
 - III. Claims 39, 40, and 41, drawn to polynucleotides comprising allelic variants, classified in class 536, subclass 23.4.
 - IV. Claims 42 and 43, drawn to allelic variant polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - V. Claim 44, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 395.
 - VI. Claim 45, drawn to methods for linkage studies, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
2. Claims 13-30 and 32-33 link(s) inventions I, II, and VI. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 13-30 and 32-33. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Claims that require all the

limitations of an allowable linking claim will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim(s) including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. In re Ziegler, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Further Restriction Requirement (Sequence Election)

Insofar as each of groups I, II, and VI include linking claims 32, a further restriction requirement is set forth. Most of the claims set forth in this application require the analysis of a particular nucleic acid position within instant SEQ ID NO: 1, that position being 1561 encoding position 488 of SEQ ID NO: 2. However, claim 32 does not specifically require the assay of this position, and instead requires the assay of “at least one” of a group of 28 different positions. In accordance with example “C” of MPEP 803.04, if applicant elects one of groups I, II or VI, applicant should further elect a SINGLE COMBINATION of “one or more” polymorphic positions for examination with the linking claims and the elected group. If this combination includes the position recited in linking claims 13-30 and in the elected claim from group I, II, and VI, then all of these claims will be examined. If the combination excludes the particular position recited in these claims (i.e. position 1561) than any claim which recites nucleotides not

Art Unit: 1634

within the elected group will be WITHDRAWN from prosecution. Prior to allowance, non-elected subject matter will be required to be deleted from any allowable claims. Applicant is advised that examination will be restricted to only the elected combination of “at least one” SNP and SEQ ID NO. and this restriction should not to be construed as a species election. In accordance with MPEP 803.04, if methods which include the elected combination is found to be allowable, then all combinations which recite the elected “at least one” position(s) will be rejoined.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I, II, and VI are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the methods are “related” because they utilize some similar methodology, namely the identification of a nucleotide within a given nucleotide sequence. However, they are distinct because they are mutually exclusive- each method includes a step that is not required for the other, such as correlating the nucleotide with response to a drug, or prescribing a drug, or analyzing the frequency of a an allele within a population. Further, the methods are not obvious variants of one another as they are directed towards methods with distinct goals and have a materially different design, function and effect.

4. Inventions I and III, inventions II and III, and inventions III and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another

materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotides of invention III can be used in a variety of methods as is exemplified by the instantly claimed methods. In addition, the polynucleotides of invention III can be used in aptamer methods and nucleic acid purification methods

5. Inventions I, II, and VI are unrelated to the products of inventions IV and V. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the methods of groups I, II, and VI do not recite or require the products of groups IV and V.

6. The inventions of Groups III, IV, and V are patentably distinct because they are drawn to different products having different structures and functions. The nucleic acids of Group III are composed of nucleotides linked in phosphodiester bonds and arranged in space as a double helix. The polypeptide of Group IV is composed of amino acids linked in peptide bonds and arranged spatially in a number of different tertiary structures including alpha helices, beta-pleated sheets, and hydrophobic loops (transmembrane domain). The antibody of Group V is also composed of amino acids linked in peptide bonds and arranged spatially in a very specific tertiary structure that allows that antibody to specifically bind to particular regions, i.e. epitopes, of the encoded polypeptide. Further, antibodies are glycosylated and their tertiary structure is unique, where four subunits (2 light chains and 2 heavy chains) associated via disulfide bonds into a Y-shaped symmetric dimer. Furthermore, the products of Groups III, IV, and V can be used in materially different processes, for example, the DNA of Group III can be used in hybridization assays, the

antibody of Group V can be used in immunoassay, the polypeptide of Group IV can be used to make fusion protein with an enzymatic function. Consequently, the reagents, reaction conditions, and reaction parameters required to make or use each invention are different.

Therefore, the inventions of Groups III, V, and VI are patentably distinct from each other.

7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper, and because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper, and because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. Regarding the further election of a single combination of polymorphic sequences for the methods of groups I, II and VI, each polymorphic sequence is patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, i.e. these sequences are unrelated because the protein encoded by these sequences differ in structure and in function and in biological activity. Further, even where the nucleic acid changes have no effect on protein structure or function, these sequences themselves represent allelic variations which have different diagnostic and therapeutic implications. A reference against one would not anticipate or obviate another, and thus for each particular sequence a separate search of the patent and non-patent literature is required. These separate searches would impose undue burden on the examiner.

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found

Art Unit: 1634

allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1634

11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Juliet C Switzer whose telephone number is (571) 272-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, or Thursday, from 9:00 AM until 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached by calling (571) 272-0735.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-0507.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of

Art Unit: 1634

the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.



Juliet C. Switzer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

May 15, 2006